

USSN: 09/997,137
Group No. 3414
Examiner: Divecha, Kamal B
Page 4

REMARKS

1. Claims 1-13 are pending in the present application. The Applicants have canceled claims 7-9 without prejudice. Claims 1, 3, 4, 10, 12 and 13 have been amended. No new matter has been added.
2. In Section 1 of the Action, the Examiner requests translation of the foreign application priority to which is claimed by Applicants. According to the Examiner, such translation is required under 37 CFR 1.55. However, the instances in which such translation is required are listed in 37 CFR 1.55(a)(4). The effective dates of the documents cited by the Examiner do not appear to require such translation. Further, although the Examiner is apparently mentioning an interference, no details at all about the interference are provided by the Examiner. As a consequence, the Applicants respectfully request clarification of the request of the Examiner.
3. In the Action, the Examiner objects to claims 3-4 and 12-13. The Applicants have amended claims 3-4 and 12-13 and respectfully submits that the objection of the Examiner has been overcome.
4. In section 1 of the Action, the Examiner rejects claims 1, 3 and 4 under 35 USC 112, second paragraph. The Applicants have amended claim 1 and respectfully submit that the rejection of the Examiner has been overcome. With reference to claims 3 and 4, the Examiner should note that antecedent for the limitation "the expansion" can be found in claim 2.
5. In section 2 of the Action, the Examiner rejects claims 7-8 under 35 USC § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Pat. No. 6,421,711 to Blumeau. The Applicants have canceled claims 7-8, thus rendering the rejection of the Examiner moot.

USSN: 09/997,137
Group No. 3414
Examiner: Divecha, Kamal B
Page 5

6. In section 3 of the Action, the Examiner rejects claims 1 and 5 under 35 USC § 103(a) as being obvious over Blumenau in view of U.S. Pat. No. 5,872,968 to Knox. The Applicants respectfully disagree.

Claim 1 as amended recites "wherein the hard disk access command complies with a peripheral interface standard allowing connection of a peripheral device to a PC." Support for this feature can be found, for example, at page 5, lines 21-23 of the present application, IDE (Integrated Drive Electronics) being an acronym to define a peripheral device standard for connecting peripheral devices such as hard disks to a PC.

With reference to Blumenau, the Examiner states that Blumenau does not disclose a transforming device receiving a hard disk command from a client. With reference to Knox, the Examiner states that Knox receives a hard disk access command from a client. The Applicants respectfully disagree with this statement. What Knox discloses is a bootrequest command in the BOOTP protocol or an RPL request code in the RPL protocol (see column 4, lines 9-17 and 30-43 of Knox). Both the bootrequest command and the RPL request code are network protocols for communication between computers. Neither of them is a command that "complies with a peripheral interface standard allowing connection of a peripheral device to a PC."

Claim 1 as amended also recites that "the server implements a requested disk access process to execute a read or write operation corresponding to the hard disk access command on the storage area relative to the diskless client." With reference to Knox, both the bootrequest command and the RPL request code are commands for accessing the boot software image from a remote server (see column 5, lines 7-23 of Knox). However, the remote server can only implement a read operation, not a write operation.

Therefore, the Applicants submit that claim 1 is patentable over Blumenau and Knox, together with claim 5, at least by virtue of its dependence on claim 1.

USSN: 09/997,137
Group No. 3414
Examiner: Divecha, Kamal B
Page 6

7. In section 4 of the Action, the Examiner rejects claims 2-4 and 6 under 35 USC § 103(a) as being obvious over Blumenau, Knox and U.S. Pat. No. 6,477,624 to Kedem. The Applicants respectfully disagree.

Claims 2-4 and 6 depend on claim 1. The Applicants have already shown that claim 1 is patentable over Blumenau and Knox. Therefore, the Examiner is not in a condition to make a prima facie 35 USC § 103(a) case against claims 2-4 and 6.

8. In section 5 of the Action, the Examiner rejects claim 9 under 35 USC § 103(a) as being obvious over Blumenau in view of Kedem. The Applicants have canceled claim 9, thus rendering the rejection of the Examiner moot.

9. In section 6 of the Action, the Examiner rejects claims 10-13 under 35 USC § 103(a) as being obvious over Kedem. The Applicant respectfully disagree.

The Examiner asserts that Kedem discloses in Figs. 2-4 a transforming device installed in a diskless client in a centralized network storage system and substantially all of the limitations of claim 10. However, although Kedem indeed discloses a transforming device (Item 202 in Figs. 2-4) comprising an interface circuit, a logical circuit and a network controller, Kedem fails to teach that the logical circuit (Item 310 in Fig. 3 and Item 406 in Fig. 4) "pack[s] both the hard disk access command [received from the diskless client] and an identity number unique to the diskless client into a package." Item 310 in Fig. 3 of Kedem just represents an embedded processor, logic circuits and memory (column 10 lines 48-51), while item 406 in Fig. 4 of Kedem just represents a control unit for controlling the dual ported RAMs and the buffer to implement the IDE protocol.

The Examiner asserts that the limitation of "packing a command and an identifier into a package" is well known in the art (packet includes a source address field, interpreted as an identifier of client). The Applicants respectfully disagree. Packing data and an identifier such as the source address field may be a routine process in TCP/IP protocol,

USSN: 09/997,137
Group No. 3414
Examiner: Divecha, Kamal B
Page 7

but, its meaning is different from packing a hard disk access command used for communication between a computer and a local hard disk into a packet, in order to access the remote server or hard disk. Thus, the Applicants submit that "packing the hard disk command and an identity number relative to the diskless client into a package" is not well known in the art. The Applicants respectfully submit that Kedem does not teach or suggest "a transforming device used in a centralized network storage system and installed in a diskless client, comprising a logical circuit for packing both a hard disk access command received from the diskless client and an identity number unique to the diskless client into a package".

It is therefore submitted that amended claim 10 is patentable over Kedem, together with claims 11-13, at least by virtue of their dependency on claim 10.

* * *

The Applicants submit that all claims of the application as amended herein are in condition for allowance. Prompt issuance of a Notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited.

USSN: 09/997,137
Group No. 3414
Examiner: Divecha, Kamal B
Page 8

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required or credit overpayment to deposit account no. 12-0415. In particular, if this response is not timely filed, then the Commissioner is authorized to treat this response as including a petition to extend the time period pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136 (a) requesting an extension of time of the number of months necessary to make this response timely filed and the petition fee due in connection therewith may be charged to deposit account no. 12-0415.

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being
facsimile transmitted to the United States Patent
and Trademark Office, fax no. (571) 273-8300 on

July 15, 2005
(Date of Deposit)

Susan Papp
(Name of Person Depositing)

Susan Papp
Signature

07/15/05
Date

Respectfully submitted,

Alessandro Steinf

Alessandro Steinf
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 56,448
LADAS & PARRY
5670 Wilshire Blvd., Suite 2100
Los Angeles, CA 90036
(323)934-2300